

# VERMONT TELEGRAPH.

"I AM SET FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE GOSPEL."

BY ORSON S. MURRAY.

BRANDON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1837.

VOL. X. NO. 2.

## TERMS.

The VERMONT TELEGRAPH is published weekly, at \$2.00 a year, payable within four months—after four months and within eight, \$2.25—after eight months and within the year, \$2.50—after the close of the year, to rise in this ratio.

To companies who receive twelve or more copies in one bundle, and pay within four months, \$1.50—after four months, to rise as above, \$1.75 within eight months &c.

Agents, who procure and pay for six subscribers, are entitled to the seventh copy gratis.

No paper to be discontinued until arrears are paid, except at the discretion of the publisher.

All letters, to secure attention, must come postage paid.

## Vermont Telegraph.

BRANDON, SATURDAY, SEPT. 30, 1837.

Below, is the Appeal, heretofore spoken of, and a review of it by Mr. Garrison.—Mr. Garrison has been accused of laboring to overthrow the *Christian ministry*. This review contains the strongest language he has ever used, on which the charge is founded. The review is therefore given entire, that he may have a fair hearing. Those who accuse him are careful not to allow him to tell his own story. None of the faithful among the ministry will have any thing to say—nor will they fear any thing—from the public being made acquainted with the views of this, or any other individual, in regard to the conduct of the ministry. Of course none will put on the coat, whom it does not fit. It will be seen that he is not laboring to overthrow the *institution of the ministry*. He only brings charges against the unfaithful of those who take upon themselves the office. As many as are faithful have nothing to fear. Read, brethren, and decide for yourselves.

From the New-England Spectator.  
**Appeal of Clerical Abolitionists on Anti-Slavery Measures.**

MR. PORTER—Several individuals, who are known in public and in private as friends of the anti-slavery cause, wish to say, through your paper, a few things with regard to some of the recent movements relative to the subject of slavery. We are abolitionists in the strictest sense; and such we purpose to be as long as there is a slave on the face of the earth. We have given our feelings, our influence and our talents, in public and in private, to the cause of immediate and universal emancipation. We regard slavery as a loud crying and exceedingly aggravated sin, under all circumstances, and at all times; and we claim that, like all other sins, it ought to be at once and forever abandoned; and we purpose with the help of God, to do all that in us lies, at home and abroad, from the pulpit and the press, to hold up this iniquitous system of robbery and wrong, as worthy only of universal and eternal abhorrence; and to call, in the name of humanity and God, on all who hold their fellow-men in chains, to desist at once from their iniquitous work. We purpose to do with our might all that our hands or our tongues find to do, to hasten the day when the yoke of the oppressor shall be broken, and the oppressed go free.

But, having given our influence, and our efforts, to some extent, to the cause of immediate emancipation, and become, in some sense, identified with it, as we wish still to be, we are not a little grieved at some things, which we see in the movements of some leading abolitionists. Some of these things we will name.

1. We cannot approve the *hasty, unsparing, and almost ferocious denunciation* of a man who happens to come from the south, which we have recently seen in the case of Rev. Mr. White. To drag a man's name into the public print, and hold him up to universal abhorrence, while neither time nor pains have been taken to ascertain the truth in relation to him, we think altogether unjustifiable. We believe that Rev. Mr. White is not, and never has been, a slaveholder, in any sense of the word, neither is his wife.—All that can be said is, that the father of Mrs. White does hold slaves; but we think it visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children too soon altogether, to call Mr. White to account at present for the sins of his father-in-law. When Mr. White has taken these slaves or any into his own hands, it will be time enough to hold him responsible for what he does with them. The attempt to tarnish his character with the sin of slaveholding, when he has never been guilty of it, we believe to be decidedly wrong.

2. *Insinuations*, thrown before the world in print, because somebody has happened to *guess* that all was not right, we believe cannot be justified. We allude particularly to the repeatedly published insinuation, that Rev. Mr. Blagden, is a slaveholder. We hardly dare trust ourselves to speak of this act of monstrous injustice. If the conductors of the Liberator know that this gentleman is a slaveholder, and have the proofs in their possession, let them boldly assert it. But to insinuate such a thing before the public, while they have no proof of it! It is a wicked, it is a base thrust at a man's reputation. We should be ashamed to lift up our heads as abolitionists, if we fail to rebuke this sin. It may perhaps be said, that Mr. Blagden can easily deny it, if it be not true, and thus put the matter at

once to rest." He has doubtless enough to do, without going into a newspaper to repel mere insinuations. The minister of the gospel who should attempt, in this day, to wage a newspaper warfare with every insinuation that might chance to be thrown out against his character, would find but little time for more important duties. For a man to attempt the defence of his own character, under any circumstances, is a painful task. And he who deals out *insinuations* against his neighbor, and then calls upon him to clear himself, "casts about firebrands, arrows, and leath in sport." Whose reputation is safe, in the hands of such a man? He may select the purest bing on earth as his victim; and suppose—and guess—that he is a thief, or an adulterer; and throw his guesses before the public.—Many will believe them to be substantial facts. Others will think there must be some ground for such accusations, and begin to entertain suspicions of the individual. Oh! if there be an act which our souls loathe, it is the attempt to destroy a man's reputation by falsehood. And insinuation is the meanest and vilest form of lying. We are grieved to see it resorted to by any one calling himself an abolitionist.

3. We wish to say a word on the subject of *notices*. It has become very common to give notices of various descriptions to ministers of the gospel, in order that they may be publicly read from the pulpit. Every minister in the city receives occasionally some notices which he thinks it improper for him to read. He has a right to be his own judge in such matters. We know of no obligation resting on any minister of the gospel, to make himself a town-crier, or his pulpit a vehicle for public information. Every pastor will of course announce his own appointments to his own people, without asking permission of any one; no man or body of men can, with any propriety, command him to announce their appointments. He has a right, we repeat it, to be his own judge. We believe that clergymen who are abolitionists, claim this right for themselves, and unhesitatingly use it; nor are we yet convinced that they are not ready to concede it to others. We have been accustomed to read anti-slavery notices in our own pulpits; and shall continue to do so, when we think it advisable, and only then. While we hope to be governed by Christian principles in this, and all other things, we shall pay no regard to the authoritative mandates of men.

We regret exceedingly the apparent tone of *demand*, with which the Liberator has urged the reading of anti-slavery notices. There are other ways by which information may be communicated, which, to say the least, are quite as orderly and decent as those that are frequently resorted to by certain individuals. We do not wish, therefore, to be identified with those who have raised an outcry against some clergymen, because they decline reading notices of anti-slavery meetings. We should indeed rejoice, if these brethren felt it to be their duty to do everything in their power to help forward the cause of immediate emancipation. We believe it to be a cause founded in righteousness and truth, and we say, with our whole hearts, God speed it to its full consummation. But we wish to see the cause move onward by the propelling force of truth and argument, and not by a spirit of domineering. We are opposed to the press-gang system of doing things as much as we are to gag-law. We wish simply to pour light on the understanding, and love into the hearts of men, and in this way to move them to exert their influence in behalf of oppressed humanity. We should be exceedingly unwilling to employ slave labor in carrying forward the work of emancipation; and hence do not wish to see those who are not yet ready to lend us their aid, scourged and lashed up to the work. A pouring forth of light, with the meekness of Christ and the patience of hope, will, in our humble opinion, do the work much better and with far greater despatch, than any measures which look like an attempt to coerce.

The above remarks apply more particularly to the conduct of ministers, while exercising their rights in their own pulpits. But what course ought an abolitionist to pursue, when in the pulpit of his brother clergyman? When it is known to him that that brother whose pulpit he occupies does not read anti-slavery notices himself, nor wish them to be read by others, should he pay no regard to his rights? It may be said, that such a brother pays no regard to *our* rights. It may be said that, 'he assumes the authority, when in the pulpit of an abolitionist, to throw away anti-slavery notices, although he is aware that it is the minister's wish that they should be read.'—True; but this does not touch the question. Is it right for one minister of the gospel to go into another's pulpit, and there take the liberty to do what he knows the presiding pastor disapproves? We say, No. 'But,' it may be objected, 'what if a large portion of the congregation are abolitionists?' It matters not. There is a proper way of dealing with a pastor, whose course the people are dissatisfied; but so long as he retains his office, it is not for another clergyman to trample upon the rights appertaining to that office. We shall read no notices whatever in a brother's pulpit, against his will. In our own desks, we shall consult our own judgment.

4. We love the cause of Foreign and

Home Missions; we love the Tract and Bible and Education societies; and we love them none the less, because our feelings are interested for our brethren in bondage. These objects of benevolence have our liveliest sympathies, our earnest prayers, and our ready contributions.—We wish to see all these things done, and the work of emancipation not left undone. In truth, one of the greatest of all reasons why we wish the immediate abolition of slavery is, that we regard it as one of the most direct and powerful hindrances to the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom. His kingdom we love; and because we believe that these several associations contribute to its increase and prosperity, we cannot sympathize with those who would withhold their prayers and aid from them, that they may bestow all upon the specific object of emancipation. We wish to see the hearts of Christians sufficiently large to embrace all these objects together. They all aim at one and the same great and glorious result—the universal triumph of Christ. We wish to see the bark of salvation speed onward, and would therefore throw slavery into the sea as a tremendous mass, greatly hindering its progress; but we have no idea of striking sail and lying by, and our canvass shivering in the wind, while we accomplish this work; in that case, it must be a late day before we could hope to see the end of the voyage. But because our bark sinks deep, we would call on all, while she is under way, laboring onward through the waves, to lend a hand, that we may lighten her as soon as possible, and increase the rate of her progress towards the long desired haven.

We wish to say, therefore, that for a full, faithful, fearless, and uncompromising declaration of the truth, and the whole truth, on the subject of slavery, we are always ready. We are willing to identify ourselves with the cause of the oppressed, and to do for them as we, in like circumstances, should wish men to do for us. But as to this attack on individual character, this denunciation, insinuation, &c.—this tone of demand upon others to surrender up their rights—this abandonment of highly important objects—we say unhesitatingly, decidedly, that we wholly disapprove of such measures, and must forever disapprove of them.

Our feelings are often exceedingly pained by the *abuse* which is heaped upon ministers of the gospel, and other excellent Christians, who do not feel prepared to enter fully into the efforts of anti-slavery societies. It is not long since we were all slumbering together over this subject. Though abolitionists feel confident that they have taken the right ground, and that those who do not stand with them are in the wrong, it certainly does not become them to call men of acknowledged piety and great worth of character, hypocrites, and knaves, because they do not just now see eye to eye with those who have had most to do in the cause of anti-slavery. The time is very fully in our recollection, when we were not abolitionists; nor are we conscious that we were then either hypocrites or knaves. We have no sympathy with those who make such indiscriminate use of these epithets. We condemn their conduct. These things do injustice to individuals and are great hindrances to our work.

These, and things of like nature, prevent many worthy men from appearing in favor of immediate emancipation. We know this to be a fact. Men who have a quick sense of propriety, are not willing to be identified with such movements. Their hearts bleed for the oppressed; but they are beaten off from active exertion in their behalf by these unjustifiable measures. They suppose that the great body of abolitionists approve of these things, because they suffer them in silence. It is moreover to be feared, that, unless a different course is pursued, many who, in times past, have labored much in this cause, will withdraw in despair, and weep in secret places.

(Signed) CHARLES FITCH, Boston.  
DAVID SANFORD, Dorchester.  
MR. M. CORNELL, Quincy.  
JONAS PERKINS, Weymouth.  
JOS. H. TOWNE, Boston.

From the Liberator.  
**A LAYMAN'S REPLY TO A 'CLERICAL' APPEAL.**

For a few weeks past, I have been residing in Connecticut, and shall not probably return to Boston before the 23d of August. On leaving the city, I committed the supervision of the Liberator to a friend, in whose judgment, editorial tact, and ability, I placed great confidence.—He has discharged his trust in a manner very satisfactory to me. Some paragraphs, however, which he has written, have been the ostensible and immediate cause of eliciting an extraordinary philippic as the anti-slavery controversy has yet brot forth on either side of the question. It is extraordinary on the score of egotism, extraordinary as to the time and manner of its publication; extraordinary as to the character of its attack; extraordinary as respects the objects of its defence; extraordinary for its inconsistency; extraordinary for its misrepresentation; extraordinary as an apology for those who either vigorously assail or give no countenance to the abolition cause; extraordinary as a 'clerical' bull. It appears in the shape of 'An Appeal of Clerical Abolitionists on Anti-Slavery Measures,' in the New-England Spectator of August 2, and was inserted in last week's Liberator. Its

objurgations are vehement and emphatic, and bestowed particularly upon this paper, that is, upon my own head—though one of my friends has furnished the occasion for the emptying of this vial of 'clerical' displeasure. It complains, first, that the Liberator has been guilty of 'hasty, unsparing, and almost ferocious denunciation' of a southern clergyman; secondly, of publishing 'wicked and base insinuations, the meanest and vilest form of lying,' against a 'clerical' associate in Boston; thirdly, of 'attempting to destroy a man's reputation by falsehood'; and fourthly, of 'authoritatively demanding' the reading of anti-slavery notices from the pulpits.—There are two other charges, one of which I presume is intended to be applied to anti-slavery publications generally, viz: 'heaping abuse upon ministers of the gospel, and other excellent Christians, who do not feel prepared to enter fully [i.e. not at all] into the efforts of anti-slavery societies'; the other is obviously meant as a thrust at the abolitionists as a body, viz: regarding all other benevolent and religious enterprises, except that of abolition, as deserving little or no countenance at the present time.

1. This 'Appeal' is extraordinary on the score of egotism. It is signed by five individuals in all, only two of whom are incidentally known abroad as the advocates of immediate emancipation. Mr. Fitch, since he went to Boston, has somewhat signalized himself in the cause by his 'hard language,' 'unsparing denunciations,' and personal 'insinuations'—so that, in listening to him, it has seemed to me that I have not yet begun to give meat for men, but only milk for new-born babes. Indeed, his opposition to slavery, and to those who are letting that horrid system alone, has been surprisingly rampant—as I shall have occasion to show. I begin to fear that the tremendous energy which he has manifested will prove to have been merely spasmodic. Mr. Towne, a few weeks before he was settled in Boston, lectured in Essex County as an anti-slavery agent; but since that time he has kept himself almost wholly aloof from our meetings, and from intercourse with abolitionists.—I have understood that he was in Boston at the annual meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society in January last, and during the week when the New-England Convention was in session; but though more than a dozen public meetings were held at those highly interesting periods, he was not present at any of them—at least, I could not learn that he was present, on strict inquiry. Avoidance like this does not evince a very lively interest in behalf of the perishing and the dumb. He has also given some private evidence that he has somewhat departed from his first love, and that he means to rank himself among the 'wise' and 'prudent.' Mr. Sanford of Dorchester, and Mr. Perkins of Weymouth, are very good men, but cautious, moderate, timid. Mr. Cornell's name is new to me, and what he has done to advance the cause of bleeding humanity, I have yet to learn. He may have done much, nevertheless. How many of these individuals do now receive, or have at any time taken the Liberator as subscribers, is better known to the proprietor than to myself; nor is it of the slightest importance, except as they have volunteered to stamp the brand of condemnation upon this paper and its editor. Now, from the earnestness and gravity which they exhibit in their 'Appeal,' a stranger, ignorant of the facts in the case, would necessarily suppose that the Atlantic burden of abolitionism rests mainly upon their shoulders; that they are the very pillars of the Temple of Emancipation; that a vast amount of responsibility is rolled upon their hands; that they are the lawful (not self-selected) censors of anti-slavery publications in general, and the Liberator in particular—so that they justly incur blame, and suffer in their character, whenever a paragraph happens to be faulty in style, or erroneous in statement, or reprehensible in language. Quite a 'mistake.' These gentlemen—'clerical' though they be—are not the giants of their race, though they are of respectable dimensions. They declare that they are 'known in public'—but they are not so tall, and by no means so conspicuous, as they seem to flatter themselves. Their clerical *ipse dixit*, their professional praise or censure, is not of national consequence, even though they send it forth upon the wings of the press, with their names duly signed at the bottom. Nor is it of any moment in the eyes of the irreverent writer of these animadversions. Most certainly, I regret that they have been disturbed in their equanimity by the tone and spirit of the Liberator; but I will venture to assure them that no equitable mind will hold them responsible for that tone or spirit.—The responsibility is mine alone. I cheerfully admit their right, and trust they will use it freely, to criticise, rebuke, instruct, denounce me and the paper which I edit, in public or in private, in a 'clerical' or lay capacity, as they shall think proper. In this instance, they have used severe terms of condemnation; of these I do not complain. If they are merited, they ought not to be softened; if unjust, they will do me no permanent injury—though they will doubtless inflict a deep wound upon the abolition enterprise by the eagerness with which they will be circulated by the enemy. How they happen to be precisely those which the worst foes of our cause have uniformly preferred, as

reasons for withholding their support from that cause, these 'clerical' abolitionists' will do well to consider.

2. This 'Appeal' is extraordinary as to the time and mode of its publication. The time selected is during my absence both from the State and the editorial chair. True, its authors were not obliged to wait until my return; but why in such hot haste to bear their testimony against a single letter of the alphabet of transgressions, of which the Liberator is reputedly guilty? Why not wait, at least, to know whether the 'almost ferocious denunciation' of the 'Rev. Mr. White,' and the 'wicked and base insinuation' against the 'Rev. Mr. Blagden,' would be endorsed or reprobated by the absent editor? But—no! These 'clerical' reprovers were impelled by a zeal which they could not control. They were resolved to *strike*, but would not stop to *hear*. To rebuke sinners is their vocation.—They belong to a class which has been wont to speak in oracular tones, as it were immediately from heaven, and men have not dared to doubt its inspiration; but the infallibility of the clergy, alas! is beginning to be stoutly denied and profanely ridiculed along with that of his Holiness the Pope. Doubtless there are some latent reasons why this anomalous 'Appeal' has been put forth at the present time. What 'private griefs' its authors have to indulge, I know not. The attack is truly portentous; it is, indeed expressly significant, if not to the understanding of others, at least to my own—it comes in a 'clerical' shape! Nor is the mode of publication less worthy of notice. Why was this 'Appeal' sent to the New-England Spectator, rather than to the Liberator? Was such a course manly or ingenious? The preference was unreasonable; it seems to me an impeachment of my willingness to give it publicity—an impeachment far more offensive to me than the 'Appeal' itself. What did the readers of the Spectator know of the alleged baseness and falsehood of the Liberator, in the cases referred to by these five 'clerical' abolitionists? They could not have read the obnoxious articles, as they were not copied into the Spectator. The injury (if any) was done in the columns of this paper: why, then, did not these generous volunteers in behalf of the enemies of their own most righteous cause, seek redress through the same medium? When have I refused to let friend or foe castigate me, to his heart's content, in the Liberator?

3. This 'Appeal' is extraordinary as to the character of its attack.

It comes from professed abolitionists—from those who think their abolition orthodoxy cannot be doubted. Omitting a very few words in it, it is precisely such a homily, in its extenuation, its perverseness, its sophistry, its denunciation, as Joseph Tracy and brother, Asa Cummings, Leonard Bacon and Wilbur Fisk, (the number five is complete,) could and will unquestionably adopt with shouts of exultation. It is pregnant with the same dolorous cant which has so long characterized the Boston Recorder, Christian Mirror, Vermont Chronicle, &c. &c., about 'base thrusts at a man's reputation'; about 'hasty, unsparing, and almost ferocious denunciation'; about 'wicked and base insinuations'; about 'casting around fire-brands, arrows and death'; about 'the right of every minister to be his own judge' as to his duty to read anti-slavery notices; about 'their ignorance of any obligation resting on any minister of the gospel to make himself a town-crier, or his pulpit a vehicle for public information'; about 'a spirit of domineering'; about 'the press-gang system of doing things'; about 'an unwillingness to employ slave-labor in carrying forward the work of emancipation'; about 'scourging and lashing men up to the work'; about 'attempts to coerce'; about the folly of 'striking sail, and lying by, our canvass shivering in the wind, while we accomplish this work'; about 'this attack on individual character, this denunciation, insinuation, &c.—this tone of demand upon others to surrender up their rights—this abandonment of highly important objects'; about 'wholly disapproving such measures, now and forever'; about 'the abuse which is heaped upon ministers of the gospel, and other excellent Christians, who do not feel prepared to enter fully into the efforts of anti-slavery societies'; about 'calling men of acknowledged piety and great worth of character hypocrites and knaves, because they do not just now see eye to eye with those who have had most to do in the anti-slavery cause'; about 'heating off those, whose hearts bleed for the oppressed, from active exertion in their behalf by these unjustifiable measures'; about 'the propelling force of truth and argument, and love into the hearts of men, and in this way to move them to exert their influence in behalf of oppressed humanity,' &c. &c. &c. All these are merely the stale repetitions of what has been falsely iterated a thousand times over by pro-slavery advocates and mawkish apologists of slaveholders ever since my voice was first lifted up in the cause of my enslaved countrymen. They have not even the poor merit of originality—being most palpable plagiarisms from

\* Jesus Christ did so, and thereby gave great offence to the chief priests, rulers, &c. We unto you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithes of mint, and anise, and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith. Ye do despise ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?

the columns of all the colonization presses in the land. Every discriminating, 'dyed-in-the-wool' abolitionist will perceive, at a glance, that they are an embolism of the most common, most flippant, most plausible objections to the anti-slavery cause, its advocates and measures, which have been urged by the rulers in church and state for the last five years. Indeed, so thickly interspersed are these charges and 'insinuations' throughout this sacred 'Appeal,' by the hands of these professed fellow-laborers, they at first appear like ingenious strokes of satire, intended for the backs of Messrs. Fisk, Stuart, Bacon, Tracy and Cummings, though seemingly applied with mock gravity to 'some leading abolitionists.' But they are not used sportively—they are seriously uttered, so that all the aspersions and pleas of the pro-slavery fraternity just alluded to are fully endorsed by 'several individuals,' i.e. five 'clerical' abolitionists, 'who are known,' or think they are known, 'in public and in private, as friends of the anti-slavery cause'!! There is also a remarkable similarity in the hypothetical and guarded form of reasoning resorted to by these ten censors. The old form used to run thus:—'I am as much opposed to slavery as you are. . . BUT—' In the 'Appeal,' it is as follows:—'We regard slavery as a loud crying, and exceedingly aggravated sin. . . BUT—we are not a little grieved at some things, which we see in the movements of some leading abolitionists.' Again: 'We believe it to be a cause founded in righteousness and truth. . . BUT—we have no idea of striking sail.' Again: 'We are willing [what condescension!] to identify ourselves with the cause of the oppressed. . . BUT—as to this attack on individual character, this denunciation, insinuation, &c. Finally: 'Men who have a quick sense of propriety, (!) are not willing to be identified with such movements. Their hearts bleed for the oppressed, (!) . . . BUT—they are beaten off from active exertion in their behalf, [i.e. deterred from performing the part of the good Samaritan, and compelled to act the part of the Priest and Levite!] by these unjustifiable measures.' Is it possible that this is the dialect of genuine abolitionists? Why, even such papers as the Boston Recorder and Vermont Chronicle have measurably discarded it, and are almost ashamed to use it! Who, for one moment, can doubt that it will fall like a strain of music upon the ears of 'gentlemen of property and standing,' of the advocates of lynch law, of southern taskmasters and their apologists, of a time-serving priesthood, of all that is corrupt, oppressive and worthless in the land? What is it, at least, what will the vile creature it to mean, but a new justification of mobocratic violence? How can our modern 'scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites,' regard it but as an all-sufficient excuse for standing aloof from the anti-slavery cause, eulogized as 'men who have a quick sense of propriety?' *Et tu, Brute!*

4. This 'Appeal' is extraordinary as respects the objects of its defence. Its tenderness and charity towards Messrs. White and Blagden, are wholly misplaced. The accused have made no public complaint of ill-treatment;—nor, in view of the sentiments which they hold on the subject of slavery, do I see how they can complain, either in public or private. They have apparently regarded the 'denunciations' and 'insinuations' of the Liberator, either as too frivolous to require any refutation, or too harmless to do them any injury. If they are not disposed to stand up in self-defence, why should five 'clerical' abolitionists be so filled with rampant zeal in their favor? What right have these five to assume, that these two men feel that their characters have been wantonly assailed, when they preserve unbroken silence?—or to predicate upon this assumption, that the editor of the Liberator has been guilty of wilful defamation? This jealousy for the reputation of Messrs. White and Blagden is highly ludicrous, and absurdly magnanimous. To say positively that Mr. White is a slaveholder, and to 'insinuate' such a thing, before the public,' respecting Mr. Blagden, 'while there is no proof of it, is a wicked, it is a base thrust at a man's reputation,—the meanest and vilest form of lying.' Nay, 'we hardly dare trust ourselves to speak of this act of monstrous injustice.' I should laugh at this excessive perturbation, if I could make myself merry with those who are in pain, whether it be self-inflicted or otherwise. The crime alleged is, that a southern clergyman, who lately preached in Park-street pulpit, has been charged in the Liberator with being a slaveholder—and that the clergyman who officiates in the Old South Church has by 'insinuation' been accused of the same thing. Now, is this to 'hold them up to universal abhorrence?' By no means. None but 'fanatical abolitionists' believe that slaveholding is a crime in all cases and under all circumstances whatsoever. Mr. Blagden holds and maintains that, in itself considered, it is a relation sanctioned by God, supported by revelation, consistent with Christian character, and in many cases signally philanthropic and praiseworthy. As Mr. White is from the South,—his father-in-law being a slaveholder,—I have no reason to suspect that his views differ from Mr. B's respecting the act of slaveholding.—Is it, then, 'an act of monstrous injustice,' a base thrust at the reputation of Mr. Blagden, to 'insinuate' that he practices what he preach-